

amiss. I am prepared to debate the subject now, or at any later time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I point out that there was no intent or thought to criticize in any way the distinguished majority leader, for whom I have the greatest regard and affection. I had listened to the remarks, and I merely felt that as a Senator and as a member of the Armed Services Committee I had a right to express my feelings on what I thought were the functions and the duties and the purposes of this particular committee in this particular fashion.

I could join most heartily in criticizing some of the past policies and activities of both the military and Department of State over the years. I am completely in accord with the distinguished majority leader that a great deal has been left to be desired.

I think that, possibly, had their functions been better carried out, we would have far fewer problems to face today.

I am afraid that maybe my remarks have been misrepresented to the majority leader. I did not rise in contention. I did not rise in criticism. I rose only to say that in my understanding the purpose and function of this particular committee was expressed very well on page 1 of the report and that as far as I was concerned I thought maybe the matters of policy and use and deployment and what happens between the Department of Defense, the executive, and the Department of State might well be kept for another time or another place.

I merely said that it seemed that our function had to do with the procurement of military equipment as set up by request by the Department of Defense and as carefully gone over by the committee under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

I hope the Senator will understand my remarks and the fact that they were not in any way meant to be argumentative. I would not presume to do so under any circumstances.

I merely said it was my hope that the limitations we want to be implied were not only applied, but were also carefully spelled out and that the Senate might very well carefully carry on in the particularly difficult job we have before us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from California had to say. I do not at all find his remarks amiss, but I do wish to point out that there is great difficulty in defining the lines where the authority and the responsibility of one committee ends, and where that of another begins. There is overlap.

It is almost impossible in this day and age, for example, to differentiate in some instances the line of demarcation between foreign policy and defense. The example I used of the Spanish bases is one illustration, and the example of the troops stationed abroad is another.

When we station so many troops and maintain so many bases abroad for so long, we invariably create problems that impinge on the field of foreign policy.

I hope, as does the Senator from California, that it would be possible to bring about a delineation between the two, because the military has persisted in its desire to compete with the State Department in many places where it has no primary responsibility.

Let me make it clear that I am not one of those who feel that it is good politics or good sense to denigrate the "brass." I have great respect and admiration for the military, and the fact that a man happens to wear an eagle or a few stars on his shoulders does not dilute that respect one bit.

I am appalled at the intensity of the attack on the military at times. I would hope we would understand, above all others, that those men who wear the uniform are carrying out their duties and their obligations as they are ordered to do and that they are doing the best they can in the light of the ability they possess.

I thank the Senator for clearing up the subject.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. I am pleased that I find my feelings are so closely in accord with his.

One of the things that bothers me from time to time is that confusion sets in and we lose a direct objective in some of our thoughts and discussions and debates.

As I have said, I heartily agree with the distinguished majority leader and hope for the day when all of these troops deployed around the world can be brought home.

I would hope for the day that all of the bases we have to maintain could be finally closed.

I join with the Senator in deploring some of the policies and mistakes of the past that have made this situation necessary.

One of the reasons I became interested in running for office was the fact that I disagreed with so many of the policies pursued over the last 40 years.

I am pleased to join with the distinguished majority leader in his hope. But I also make the point that, so far as I am concerned, the particular discussion—the matter of the business before the Senate—is the procurement, the testing, and the development of military hardware, not the policy, not the deployment, not the use, not the matters that in my opinion are rightfully in the field of discussion of foreign policy, for the executive, and for the Department of State.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. But the Senator knows as well as I that this bill contains the proposal to deploy the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. I am sure that is what the distinguished Senator has in mind basically, as well as the remainder of the bill which will be the pending business shortly. And there are many questions that will be raised about this or, for that matter, any measure that authorizes the expenditure of such a vast sum of money.

With respect to the ABM proposal alone, there is the question of the costs which have already skyrocketed from an initial \$6.4 billion to approximately \$10.3

or \$10.4 billion. There is the question of the reliability of the radar system contemplated, and not only its reliability, but also its vulnerability.

There is a question relative to the reliability of the computer system; a system as complex and complicated as any ever devised according to the experts. And there is the question also that if and when an ABM system is needed, why are there not deployed enough Spartans and Sprints instead of the relatively scarce number contemplated today?

A third factor does bring the question squarely into the field of foreign policy. That is the question of possible negotiations between the Soviet Union and our country seeking to bring about an arms limitation or an arms agreement and the effect of the deployment contemplated in this bill on those negotiations.

If such an agreement can be achieved, it is thought by some of us at least, that not only will a good deal of money be saved and used in facing up to our domestic difficulties—and they are many—but perhaps an era of stability and peace will begin to envelop the people of the world at the same time.

When we get to the subject of negotiations, I think it should be made clear that the President already has announced the appointment of six members to represent this country; and he has indicated that they will start negotiations either the latter part of this month or the first part of August. It would be my hope that these negotiations would get underway. They would be carried on, I believe, under the aegis of the Disarmament Agency, which I believe is an arm of the State Department. In my opinion, it would be proper for that effort to be undertaken; and because of that possibility and that hope, there is a definite relationship, I think, between the ABM and the field of foreign policy.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree with my distinguished colleague that there is a very definite relationship.

First, may I say that I had not intended nor had I thought of the particular discussion of the ABM or any other of the particular matters of procurement individually. I was merely thinking in terms of the functioning of this committee. It seems to me that there is a proper place for the policy discussions, and I would hope that they would take place.

But it also seems to me that the matter of this particular committee has to do with the assessment of the requests for procurement sent by the Department of Defense, to go over them carefully, in an attempt to protect, in every way we can, the rights of the taxpayers, to make certain that there are not unnecessary purchases and unnecessary research and development, and that the matters of policy be left to another time.

I still have the hope that we might resolve some of this without too much direction toward the policy, the use, the deployment, and stay within the responsibility of the committee. I grant that I am a new member of the Committee on Armed Services, and perhaps as time goes on I will be inclined to get into other

airport modernization, before the vice president of engineering for all the airlines. I pointed out to him, as the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, that O'Hare Airport is an anachronism. So is Los Angeles. My own field at Denver is likewise. The only modern one we have is Dulles, and we might as well use it while we can.

I do not know that I would want to go along with the Senator's suggestion that we get rid of Washington National Airport entirely, because I suspect there will be much general aviation, at least, that will want to use that airport and will still be using reciprocal engines for quite a while.

But there may eventually be a shift over, and we may have to get rid of it as an airport and use it for other purposes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OVERLAPPING OF FUNCTIONS BETWEEN THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES AND THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I should like at this point to remark on the colloquy that took place earlier in the day with respect to the hearing in the Committee on Armed Services, in which it was suggested that there might be an overlap between the function of the Committee on Armed Services and that of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I should like to state that as far as I am concerned, it is my understanding and belief that the two committees have completely distinct and different functions, and I see no reason why there should be an overlap in the hearings on the subject matter that is presently before the Senate.

I read from the first page of the report of the Committee on Armed Services on the pending measure:

This bill would (1) authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1970 for (a) major procurement, (b) research, development, test, and evaluation by the Department of Defense, and (c) for the construction of certain missile test facilities at Kwajalein; (2) continue the authority for reorganizing military assistance financing for South Vietnam, other free world forces there, Laos, and Thailand, with the funding of the Department of Defense; and (3) authorize the personnel strengths for fiscal year 1970 for the Selected Reserve of each of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

It is stated very clearly, it seems to me, that this bill is for procurement, for the purpose of supplying funds necessary, as requested by the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense, and as recommended to this body by the Committee on Armed Services after very long

and careful hearings, excellently conducted, may I say, by our distinguished chairman.

I think that there are entirely different responsibilities, entirely different purposes, and entirely different areas of interest between the two committees, and I respectfully submit that it is my great hope and desire that my fellow Senators, in their enthusiasm, will not permit a confusion of purposes to occur in the present debate.

The Committee on Armed Services has a very definite purpose. We have considered the request, and we have come before the Senate with recommendations for procurement, and procurement only. The bill has nothing to do with policy; it has nothing to do with Executive orders for distribution, effective deployment, or the rest. Those are matters for another committee.

I sincerely hope that, in pursuing the present order of business, my fellow Senators will bear this distinction carefully in mind.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present in the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from California made some remarks about the colloquy which I had earlier with the distinguished Senator from Arizona. It is my understanding that the Senator's remarks had to do with the authority, the responsibility, and the areas of concern of the particular committees, and it is my further understanding that the Senator from California stated that the lines are pretty clear and distinct.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that in the period since the end of the Second World War, and most especially since the Korean conflict, there has been a very close relationship in the administrations, both Democratic and Republican, between the Defense and State Departments. I personally am unhappy at the amount of authority which the Defense Department has had, by and large, in the foreign policy affairs of this Nation. When I think of the fact that now there are almost 2,700 American bases throughout the world; when I think of the fact that we have something on the order of a million and three-quarters military personnel, dependents, and indigenous workers located on those bases; when I think of the fact that they occupy 4,000 square miles of land, that they are located in 30 countries, and that they cost this Government at least \$4.8 billion a year to maintain, then I do think that there is a question about infringement by the Defense Department, or the military, if you will, in the foreign policy of the United States.

I was brought up to believe that the foreign policy of this country was conducted by the Department of State, act-

ing under the direction of the President. Conditions have changed; I realize that. But I think that the military has had too much to say in the promulgation of foreign policy, and I blame that state of affairs on the State Department under previous administrations, and on the Senate for allowing it to happen. The illustration which was brought out during the debate on the national commitments resolution, covering the situation in Spain, is a prime example. There the Secretary of State, under a previous Democratic administration, delegated to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the responsibility for carrying on negotiations seeking to bring about an extension of leases on the bases which we occupy, by grace of the Spanish Government, and at a good price to Spain itself.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, as I recall, delegated that authority to an Air Force general, General Burchinal, who was then stationed, I believe, at Wiesbaden, in West Germany; and he, carrying out his orders—and I find no fault with either General Wheeler or General Burchinal—entered into negotiations with Spanish authorities.

As a result of those negotiations, and only because an article appeared in the U.S. press under the byline of a Flora Lewis, did we know that certain commitments were almost on the point of being made, which would have involved this country in the affairs of Spain vis-a-vis its present or possible future relations with certain African countries.

I would hope that this trend of a dual military-State Department supervision and control of our foreign affairs would be mitigated, at least, and done away with if possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think that there is in process under this administration such a move, and if I am correct in my assumption, I assure the President of the United States that the Senator from Montana will give him his full support.

I had thought that the colloquy which I had with the distinguished Senator from Arizona was a frank and candid exposition on an important question which he raised, a question which does confront the distinguished minority leader and the majority leader from time to time, when committee chairmen come to us and tell us that another committee has undertaken to hold hearings in an area where the original committee feels it has full responsibility.

Let me point out to the distinguished Senator from California that there was nothing personal in my remarks in answer to the questions—and good questions they were—raised by the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER). I thought we understood the bounds within which we could converse and the bounds of the question involved.

I was therefore surprised to note that what I had said may have been taken

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 11249) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 11249) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such Center, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Eighty-Seventh Quarterly Report on Export Control for the first quarter of 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT WITH RESPECT TO INDIVIDUALS IN MENTAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Social Security Act to limit Federal financial participation under the public assistance and medicare laws with respect to individuals in mental institutions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on selected aspects of payments and charges to Job Corps members, Department of Defense, Office of Economic Opportunity, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES FOR TEACHERS OF BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS SCHOOLS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Section 5723 (b) of Title 5, United States Code, relating to length of service required by teachers in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools when travel and transportation expenses are paid to the first post of duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT IN JUDICIAL MACHINERY IN CUSTOMS COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the judicial machinery in customs courts by amending the statutory provisions relating to judicial actions and administrative proceedings in customs matters, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:
A petition of the Rochester Police Locust Club, Inc., of Rochester, N.Y., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1686. A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the United States Park Police (Rept. No. 91-295).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1075. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct investigations, studies, surveys, and research relating to the Nation's ecological systems, natural resources, and environmental quality, and to establish a Council on Environmental Quality (Rept. No. 91-296).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2570. A bill to provide for the termination within eighteen months of the use of Washington National Airport by jet aircraft, and to develop a plan for high speed surface transportation connecting the city of Washington with Dulles International Airport and Friendship International Airport; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FANNIN:

S. 2571. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. FANNIN when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 2572. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in a feasibility study of the Amargosa Project, Nevada and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2573. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. STEVENS:

S. 2574. A bill to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the shipment at Government expense of motor vehicles owned by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2575. A bill for the relief of Apolino Taganna Delovino; and

S. 2576. A bill for the relief of Flora Landicho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS when he introduced the first above bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIER:

S. 2577. A bill to provide additional mortgage credit and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. PROXMIER when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2571—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR NATIONAL CEMETERIES IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona. It is my understanding that 38 States in the United States now have national cemeteries. Arizona today has a higher percentage of its total population who are veterans of various declared wars and conflicts than any other State in the Union. No doubt this ratio will continue through the years ahead due to the fact that many disabled veterans do migrate to Arizona for health reasons. Since Arizona is now the second most rapidly growing State in the Union and since the population of the State is estimated to double by 1985, it would be most appropriate to have a national cemetery in the State of Arizona.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Arizona Senate Memorial No. 3, urging the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona, be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the memorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2571) to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona, introduced by Mr. FANNIN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The memorial presented by Mr. FANNIN is as follows:

SENATE MEMORIAL 3

A memorial urging the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

The State of Arizona does not have a National Cemetery within its boundaries. The influx of veterans into the State of Arizona is due to the fact that for many years there have been many military installations located in the State. Moreover, thousands of veterans have moved to Arizona to take advantage of the dry, healthful climate.

A deceased veteran, who has expressed a desire to be buried in a National Cemetery, has to be transported to a distant point in another State for burial.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona prays:

1. That the Congress provide for the establishment of a National Cemetery in the State of Arizona.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit a copy of this Memorial to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each member of the Arizona Congressional delegation.

S. 2572—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ENGAGE IN A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF THE AMARGOSA PROJECT, NEVADA AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am introducing, on behalf of Senator BIBLE,

fields. However, at the moment, as I have said, it would seem that the purpose of the committee, as stated so clearly, is as I understood it; and I would hope that the discussion of policy could and would take place, in which I would be more than happy to join with my distinguished colleague, because there are many areas in which I have had differences of opinion over the years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the distinguished Senator's remarks.

CANADA'S NATIONAL DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on July 1, our neighbor to the north, Canada, observed its National Day.

There is a very close relationship between the State of Montana and the Province of Alberta especially, but also with the Provinces of British Columbia on the west and Saskatchewan on the east.

It has been my privilege, together with the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the ranking Republican in this body, to represent the Senate in 11 interparliamentary meetings conducted in both the United States and Canada.

We feel that we have an unusually close relationship with Canada, and we are delighted that this nation of 21 million persons, with a gross national product of \$67 billion, is progressing as well as it is, and that its future is so bright.

Canada is now a country of 10 Provinces and two territories, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and northward to the Arctic.

I should like to read to the Senate a statement made by the Honorable Campbell Moodie, Consul General of Canada, who is stationed at Seattle, in whose area of responsibility Montana is incorporated—at least, in that general consular area—in which he recently wrote to the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune that in addition to being the United States closest neighbors and allies, Canadians are the people—

Who occupy a good portion of your environment on this continent.

Who are hosts to about a third of your direct foreign investment in the whole world.

Who account for better than a quarter of your total international trade (far more than any other country and much more than most of the usual groups of countries; in fact, your trade with us is as great as the combined total of your trade with Japan, Britain, Germany and France together).

Who share similar ways of living and common ideals.

Then the Consul General, quoting one of the outstanding "new generation" statesmen, I believe, in the field of world diplomacy, the distinguished Prime Minister of Canada, Pierre Elliot Trudeau, who recently pointed out that as much as the two nations are alike, as much as they have in common both with one another and toward other nations, Canada and the United States are different. The Prime Minister said:

And each of us is healthier as a result of that difference.

In the words of the Great Falls Tribune:

The United States is really fortunate to have such a good neighbor and ally as Canada has been.

U.S. friendship with Canada must be cemented in every possible way—by mutual respect, understanding and cooperation.

Canada, a great nation already although in its early development stages, has a tremendous future.

I look forward to continued cooperation between this country and Canada, under the leadership of President Richard Nixon and Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau. They both have difficult jobs. I wish them both success, because, if they both succeed, it will be all to the best for both our countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "Our Neighbor's Holiday—Canada's National Day," published in the Great Falls Tribune, Great Falls, Mont., on July 5, 1969, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OUR NEIGHBOR'S HOLIDAY: CANADA'S NATIONAL DAY

While celebrating our national holiday, the Fourth of July observance of Independence Day, not many citizens of the United States acknowledge the national holiday of Canada, our closest neighbor and best friend.

Canada observed its National Day on July 1, 102 years after it was born by the unification of four provinces and the attainment of independence.

Canada now is a country of 10 provinces and two territories stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and northward into the Arctic.

From its earliest settlement in 1605, Canada has developed into a nation of more than 21 million persons with a gross national product of more than \$67 billion.

Campbell Moodie, Consul General of Canada who is stationed at Seattle, recently wrote to The Tribune that in addition to being the United States' closest neighbors and allies, Canadians are the people:

"Who occupy a good portion of your environment on this continent.

"Who are hosts to about a third of your direct foreign investment in the whole world.

"Who account for better than a quarter of your total international trade (far more than any other country and much more than most of the usual groups of countries; in fact, your trade with us is as great as the combined total of your trade with Japan, Britain, Germany and France together).

"Who share similar ways of living and common ideals."

Consul General Moodie quoted Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau who recently pointed out that as much as the two nations are alike, as much as they have in common—both with one another and towards other nations—we are different.

"And each of us is healthier as a result of that difference," Prime Minister Trudeau said.

The United States is really fortunate to have such a good neighbor and ally as Canada has been.

U.S. friendship with Canada must be cemented in every possible way—by mutual respect, understanding and cooperation.

Canada, a great nation already although in its early development stages, has a tremendous future.

NEW APPROACH TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION GUIDELINES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the kindest critique of the Nixon administra-

tion's wobbly new approach to school desegregation guidelines would be to call it "indecisive."

United Press International, after having a day to mull over the administration's stand, stated:

The Nixon Administration has scrapped the September desegregation deadline from some Southern schools in a policy statement that seemed deliberately calculated to confuse liberals and Southerners alike into believing each had won:

The announcement of the administration's position was apparently timed for a hoped-for burial on the July 4 holiday weekend, but nevertheless drew the sharp reactions it deserved.

What, exactly, is the administration's position on the guidelines? As defined by the Baltimore Sun, it is abandonment of "full across-the-board school desegregation this fall" while "declaring full commitment to the principle of school integration in the North as well as the South." "As could be expected," the New York Times said, "it had something for everybody."

The National Education Association, composed of a million teachers and school administrators, voted at its Philadelphia convention to "insist" that the Nixon administration restore the September 1969, deadline for desegregation by all southern school districts. I applaud them for this firm and forthright action.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, meantime, issued a policy statement maintaining that the guidelines adopted in March, 1968, "are still in effect." The HEW statement—issued 4 hours after the basic policy statement which had been put out jointly by HEW Secretary Robert Finch and Attorney General John Mitchell—was described by the Baltimore Sun as "a bizarre footnote to the day's events."

The New York Times commented:

When Robert H. Finch . . . failed in the matter of the Knowles appointment, he took comfort in the thought that "Sometimes when you lose one battle you are strengthened for another."

From the administration's long-awaited policy statement on school desegregation it appears that the Secretary has strengthened himself further by losing again, a process that may do him good but is rough on the causes he favors.

Once more, the administration seesawed back the other way and seemingly tried to patch things up with the other side by issuing some orders and filing some court actions. But the basic questions still remain.

Mr. President, when the people elect a President of the United States, they have a right to expect him to lead. At the very least they are entitled to know where he stands on such a fundamental moral issue as desegregation of schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

STATINTL

SENATE APPROVES DEFENSE MEASURE

Completes \$20-Billion Bill
After 8-Week Debate

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 18—After eight weeks of debate, the Senate completed action this evening on a military authorization bill that may mark a postwar turning point in the relationship between the Pentagon and Congress and in the nation's strategic plans and foreign commitments.

On a note of unanimity, seldom seen in the course of the debate, the Senate approved the bill, 81 to 5. The measure authorized \$20-billion in weapons and research for the military services.

Ostensibly, little was changed by the hundreds of thousands of words and the 38 days of debate on what, in years past, has been a routine, noncontroversial bill. For all their amendments and talk, the critics of the military succeeded in cutting from the bill only \$71-million, and that mostly for "social research" by the Pentagon.

Furthermore, the critics failed in their attempts to block deployment of the Safeguard missile defense system, to stop further procurement of the Air Force's C-5 transport plane, to postpone construction of a new nuclear-powered aircraft carrier and to slow the development of a new manned strategic bomber.

A Steady Retreat

The high point in the assault on the military budget came in early August when the critics failed by one vote to block deployment of the \$12-billion Safeguard system.

Since then the bipartisan group of critics has been in steady retreat, losing challenges to other major weapons programs by ever larger margins. Their final defeat came today when the Senate rejected, 63 to 23, an amendment by Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana, to limit procurement of the F-14 fighter-bomber pending a study of the cost and need for the Navy's new carrier plane.

But despite defeats on particular weapons programs, the critics, even in the opinion of some of their opponents on the Senate Armed Services Committee, have made a long-term impact that is expected to change and probably diminish the long dominance of the military establishment in Congress.

Assumptions Challenged

The critics, it is generally agreed within the Senate, have opened up for examination strategic assumptions of the defense budget that have long gone unquestioned in Congress.

They have questioned, for example, the need for a 15-carrier fleet, the desirability or practicability of maintaining nuclear "superiority" over the Soviet Union, the extent of the nation's foreign commitments, and whether the very size of the military establishment leads to unwanted commitments.

Particularly in the missile defense fight, the critics learned that the weapons and strategic issues were not so technical that they were best left to the "experts" in the Pentagon and the Armed Services Committee. And out of that fight came a still loosely knit group of some 30 to 40 Senators and their aides that is prepared to continue raising issues.

In the view of many Senators, perhaps the most important, yet admittedly subtle, change is that the burden of proof in debating military programs has been shifted to the Armed Services Committee and indirectly, to the Pentagon.

Pressure on Committee

In the past, the Senate committee seldom questioned the judgment of the Pentagon and the Defense Department never really worried over whether its recommendations would be accepted by Congress. Now the committee has been forced into the position of questioning the judgment of the Pentagon and then justifying its conclusions to the Senate.

Even before he debate began July 7, the critics were having their impact on the Armed Services Committee. In reporting out the bill, the committee cut \$2-billion, mostly in research and development, from the recommendations of the Nixon Administration. In contrast, the committee last year added \$500-million to the research budget and then beat back attempts by the still disorganized critics to eliminate the increase.

Furthermore, the critics are claiming at least some credit for the fact that Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, sensing the changing sentiment on Capitol Hill, has decided to cut \$3-billion from the \$79-billion defense budget.

The very length of the debate illustrates the changing relationship between the Congressional military establishment and the Senate as a whole.

In the past, the Armed Service Committee would bring the bill to the Senate floor on Thursday, sometimes without even a printed report, with the expectation that it would be passed that evening or Friday by the latest. This year, Senator John C. Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, serving his first term as chairman of the committee, has been forced to stand on the floor for 38 days, sometimes impatiently but always courteously, defending the bill against attack from both sides of the aisle.

STATINTL

Stennis Panel to Follow Arms Talks

By the Associated Press

Chairman John C. Stennis of the Senate Armed Services Committee has created a special subcommittee to monitor upcoming U.S. disarmament negotiations with Russia.

A similar Senate move earlier produced a dispute between the Nixon administration and Congress.

Stennis yesterday appointed Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., to serve as chairman of the special Armed Services subcommittee.

Stennis said it is essential that the committee "follow the progress of the negotiations as closely as possible" so that if there is an arms-control agreement, it can assess the impact on U.S. military posture and the balance of strategic power.

Any arms-control treaty would

be subject to Senate ratification.

Stennis' announcement appeared to signal that he wants a share of committee jurisdiction over any such decision. A treaty up for Senate approval normally would be sent to the Foreign Relations Committee.

The Jackson subcommittee members include Stennis himself, and Sens. Harry F. Byrd Jr., D-Va., Daniel K. Inouye, D-Hawaii, Margaret Chase Smith, R-Maine, John G. Tower, R-Tex., and Edward W. Brooke, R-Mass.

After a round of secret preliminary talks in Helsinki, Finland, the United States and the Soviet Union have agreed to begin full-scale negotiations in Vienna on April 16, and to continue them later in Helsinki.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee sought but was denied an advance briefing by U.S.

disarmament experts before the American delegation went to Helsinki.

However, a day after the preliminary talks began on Nov. 17, Henry A. Kissinger, presidential adviser on national security affairs, briefed Foreign Relations committeemen of both Senate and House. The session was secret.

Sen. Albert Gore, D-Tenn., chairman of the Senate disarmament subcommittee, had sought an advance briefing from officials of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, but that appearance was canceled on administration instructions.

Gore at the time called that mystifying and disturbing.

That controversy ebbed when President Nixon promised to keep Congress informed on the disarmament talks.

STATINTL

Stennis Unit Getting New Budget Staff

By George C. Wilson
Washington Post Staff Writer

Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.) is revamping his Senate Armed Services Committee staff in response to the congressional demand to bear down harder on Pentagon budgets.

The career military men working on the committee are being replaced by budget specialists in what one long-time staffer characterized as a switch from "how much do you need to how much can you do without."

The new complexion of the committee staff also represents the end for now of the hard-swinging days of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. It frequently took on civilian defense leaders on behalf of frustrated generals and admirals.

Politically, Stennis appears to be reacting to what many lawmakers sense is a new national mood toward defense spending — a conviction that it is time to retrench and use more of the military's money for domestic programs.

Senators who fought Stennis on the floor this year in unsuccessful attempts to kill such military programs as the ABM see his reorganization as evidence that they won more in 1969 than the voting showed.

But defenders of Stennis and his Armed Services Committee argue that the only real cuts made in the Pentagon's budget authorizations this year were made by the committee, not by dovish senators.

Those arguments aside, what the staff changes mean for next year is harder challenges to the military and more cuts in its budget by the once friendly Senate forum.

Between now and spring, Samuel R. Shaw and Robert M. Neal will be replaced as professional staff members by civilian budget specialists. Shaw is a retired brigadier general in the Marine Corps and Neal a reserve Navy lieutenant commander.

By June the third military staffer of the committee, Everett L. Harper, is scheduled to leave. An Air Force colonel, he is due to retire from the service at that time. If he is replaced, committee sources said yesterday, it will be by a civilian budget specialist.

Highly Regarded

The departures of Shaw, Neal and Harper will strip the committee of military men. They were highly regarded on Capitol Hill for their ability to cut through the jargon of their cohorts and demand the hard information.

Stuart P. French, a reserve Air Force lieutenant colonel, worked on the subcommittee all this year when he went to the Pentagon's office of International Security Affairs.

A few senators this year criticized the committee practice of putting career military officers in staff positions, claiming they could not be expected to be objective when investigating their own services.

William Fine, formerly a civilian budget officer for Air Force research, recently has been added to the Armed Services Committee and another staffer from the Budget. Other recent staff additions to the committee are George Foster and David Middleton, former General Accounting Office specialists in procure-

While the total number of staff professionals remains at 11, the mix is decidedly different as Stennis gears up his committee for closer examination of Pentagon research and procurement requests.

Reduced Dependence

This year, Stennis frequently had to go to the Pentagon for ammunition to throw back at senators trying to kill military programs. The addition of budget specialists, his staff hopes, will make him less dependent on defense officials.

Stennis allowed the preparedness investigating subcommittee to go dormant when he took over the chairmanship of the Senate Armed Services Committee from Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) this year.

Stennis, who took over the preparedness subcommittee from Sen. Lyndon B. Johnson in 1961, kept the chairmanship of both it and the parent committee. For practical purposes, the staffs of the two units have been combined under Stennis and will continue to work that way.

The preparedness subcommittee under Stennis revealed the split between the military and former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara on the Rolling Thunder bombing campaign against North Vietnam.

McNamara lost that argument, with President Johnson approving many of the bombing targets his defense secretary opposed.

The subcommittee in recent years also was instrumental in pushing Pentagon civilians into letting the Navy develop a supposedly "quiet" submarine.